UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,047	02/13/2002	Norbert Becker	3286-0171P	7826

7590 03/22/2004	EXAMINER
Harness Dickey & Pierce PLC P O Box 8910 Reston, VA 20195	TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	12

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 January 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claim 1 and added claims 9-16 in the amendment filed

on 1/2/04. Claims 1-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Weinberg et al (USP 5974572).

As to claim 1, Weinberg teaches the claimed limitations:

"at least one automation object" as a node object in automatic Astra (fig. 8, col.

31, lines 40-45);

"a directory for storing object names of the at least one automation object" as a

tree 290 stores objects names such as mercury interactive online and 10K.pdf (figs. 4

&22);

"an object name assigned to a directory entry which includes first information

data as a reference to the at least one automation object" as tree stores object name

such as mercury interactive online which is used to link to other object such as company

or 10K.pdf. Thus, mercury is represented as the first information data as a reference to

the object company (fig. 4), "and third information data as a description of interfaces of

the at least one automation object" as new URLs or modified URLs are one of

description of site graphs of objects in a tree (fig. 21, col.30, lines 54-55), "wherein once

entry into the directory has taken place, the at least one automation object can be

viewed by at least one of other users and tools" in fig. 21, a user can view graph

including mercury interactive online and can selectively display the following: new

URLs, unmodified URLs (col. 30, lines 52-55), "and wherein the object name of the at

least one automation object can be used to request a reference to the at least one

automation object" as object name mercury can be used to request a reference to

another object such as xrume (fig. 3) "and wherein the at least one automation object

can be worked on by a number of users in parallel" as accessing the site by the large

numbers of concurrent visitors implies that multiple visitors work on the site in parallel or

at the same time. Thus, this information equates to a system, which permits an

automation object to be accessed on by multiple users. This site is represented as one

automation object (col. 32, lines 55-57).

Weinberg does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "second information

data as a description of technological functionality". However, Weinberg teaches for

each node that includes information such as the content type, the file size known only if

the entire file has been retrieved, the numbers of inbound links and outbound links, and

the date and time of last modification. This information implies the date and time of last

modification for the file as a description of technological functionality. The date and time

of last modification for the file is represented as second information data (fig. 4, col. 16, lines 36-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Weinberg's teaching of each node that includes information such as the content type, the file size known only if the entire file has been retrieved, the numbers of inbound links and outbound links, and the date and time of last modification in order to allow a user to keep track objects following an order and save time for search/retrieve objects based on description.

As to claims 2 and 10, Weinberg teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the directory entry includes fourth information data for listing the names of subcomponents of the at least one automation object" in fig. 4, the system displays a tree including root node mercury interactive online and list leaf nodes names such as mercury interactive empl, company, 10K.pdf.

As to claims 3, 5, 11 and 13, Weinberg teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the automation system includes means for the automatic entry of an automation object into the directory" as one important feature of Astra, referred to herein as Automatic Update, allows the user to update an existing web site map which includes objects by selecting a start Automatic Update. Thus, when the system updates web site map, the system updates objects too. Updating includes entering a new URL or object into tree (figs. 1& 4, col. 10, lines 25-40).

As to claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14-16, Weinberg teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the automation system includes means for indicating that an automation object is no longer available" as deleted URLs box in fig. 21 indicate URLs is no longer available and "that a copy of the object is being created" as downloading the home page only if the page has been modified since the last scanning of the URL (col. 20, lines 55-60).

As to claim 9, Weinberg teaches the claimed limitations:

"a memory for storing at least one object name of at least one automation object as a directory entry in a directory" as (fig. 8, col. 31, lines 40-45),

"wherein an object name includes, first information data as a reference to the at least one automation object" as tree stores object name such as mercury interactive online which is used to link to other object such as company or 10K.pdf. Thus, mercury is represented as the first information data as a reference to the object company (figs. 4 &22);

"third information data as a description of an interface of the at least one automation object, wherein the at least one automation object, when in the directory, is viewable by at least one of another user and tool" in fig. 21, a user can view graph including mercury interactive online and can selectively display the following: new URLs, unmodified URLs (col. 30, lines 52-55),

"wherein the object name of the at least one automation object is usable to request a reference to the at least one automation object" as object name mercury can be used to request a reference to another object such as xrume (fig. 3),

" and wherein the at least one automation object is usable by a plurality of users in parallel" as accessing the site by the large numbers of concurrent visitors implies that multiple visitors work on the site in parallel or at the same time. Thus, this information equates to a system, which permits an automation object to be accessed on by multiple users. This site is represented as one automation object (col. 32, lines 55-57).

Weinberg does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "second information data as a description of technological functionality". However, Weinberg teaches for each node that includes information such as the content type, the file size known only if the entire file has been retrieved, the numbers of inbound links and outbound links, and the date and time of last modification. This information implies the date and time of last modification for the file as a description of technological functionality. The date and time of last modification for the file is represented as second information data (fig. 4, col. 16, lines 36-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Weinberg's teaching of each node that includes information such as the content type, the file size known only if the entire file has been retrieved, the numbers of inbound links and outbound links, and the date and time of last modification in order to allow a user to keep track objects following an order and save time for search/retrieve objects based on description.

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169).

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703-305-9790). The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

3/16/04

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER